UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/722,575 | 11/28/2003 | Martin Broberg | TPP 31708 | 4961 |
| | 7590 03/28/200 CE + QUIGG L.L.P. | EXAMINER | | |
| 1300 Eye Street, N.W. | | | GOFF II, JOHN L | |
| 1000 West Tower Washington, DC 20005 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1791 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 03/28/2008 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|--|---|----------------|--|--|--|--|
| Interview Summary | 10/722,575 | BROBERG ET AL. | | | | |
| mierview Gammary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | John L. Goff | 1791 | | | | |
| All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): | | | | | | |
| (1) John L. Goff. | (3) | | | | | |
| (2) <u>Thomas Pavelko</u> . | (4) | | | | | |
| Date of Interview: 24 March 2008. | | | | | | |
| Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)⊡ Video Conference c)⊡ Personal [copy given to: 1)⊡ applicant 2)⊡ applicant's representative] | | | | | | |
| Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) discussed: <u>All</u> . | | | | | | |
| Identification of prior art discussed: <u>All</u> . | | | | | | |
| Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) № N/A. | | | | | | |
| Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants representative and the examiner discussed a possible amendment to require "said balance layer consisting of a thermoplastic polymer" which amendment appears to the examiner to be commensurate in scope with applicants argument that the laminate of the invention is asymmetrical which amendment would then appear to overcome the references applied to teach a symmetrical laminate. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS | | | | | | |
| INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | /John L. Goff/ | **** | | | | |
| | Primary Examiner, Art Unit 17 Examiner's signature, if require | | | | | |